B·O·S·C
BOARD OF SCIENTIFIC COUNSELORS

DRINKING WATER MID-CYCLE REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

Conference Call Summary
Thursday, April 26, 2007
10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. Eastern Time

Welcome

Dr. Gary Sayler, University of Tennessee, Subcommittee Chair

Dr. Gary Sayler, Chair of the Drinking Water Mid-Cycle Review Subcommittee, welcomed the Subcommittee members to the conference call and thanked them for participating in this mid-cycle review. During a previous administrative conference call, the Subcommittee members were briefed about the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) requirements and received preliminary writing assignments. The face-to-face meeting is scheduled for May 23, 2007. The purpose of this call is to review background materials to prepare for the face-to-face meeting and to receive clarification on any of the information, if necessary. Because this is a mid-cycle review, the Subcommittee's charge is to evaluate the progress that has been made during the 2 years since the program review was conducted by the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC). The Subcommittee will prepare a draft letter report at or soon after the May 23, 2007 meeting that will be sent to the BOSC Executive Committee for approval.

Administrative Procedures

Ms. Edith Coates, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/Office of Research and Development (ORD), Subcommittee Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

Ms. Edith Coates thanked the Subcommittee members for their service to EPA and explained the function of the Subcommittee. The BOSC is a federal advisory committee that advises ORD. The Drinking Water Mid-Cycle Review Subcommittee was established by the BOSC Executive Committee to review the progress of the Drinking Water Research Program (DWRP), since the 2005 program review. The Subcommittee has been asked to respond to charge questions and to provide a report to the BOSC Executive Committee for its deliberation. The Executive Committee will review the report, make any necessary revisions, and submit it to ORD. The role of BOSC is to provide recommendations to ORD, but the rights of decision-making remain with the Agency.

The face-to-face meeting will be held on May 23, 2007, in Newport, Rhode Island. Additional meetings or conference calls can be scheduled as necessary. A conference call, which will most likely take place in late June or July, will be scheduled as a followup to the face-to-face meeting. A notice for this call will be placed in the *Federal Register* at least 15 days prior to the call.

Ms. Coates reviewed the FACA procedures that are required for all BOSC Subcommittee meetings. As the DFO for the Drinking Water Mid-Cycle Review Subcommittee,

Ms. Coates serves as the liaison between the Subcommittee, the public, and EPA and ensures that all FACA requirements are met.

Ms. Coates stated that all meetings and conference calls involving substantive issues, whether in person, by phone, or by e-mail, that include one-half or more of the Subcommittee members must be open to the public, and a notice must be placed in the *Federal Register* at least 15 calendar days prior to the call or meeting. The Subcommittee Chair and DFO must be present at all conference calls and meetings, and a summary of this call will be made available to the public after certification by the Subcommittee Chair. The Chair must certify the summary within 90 days of the call. The summary then will be posted on the BOSC Web Site (http://www.epa.gov/osp/bosc).

In developing today's agenda, an attempt was made to allow adequate time for the Agency presentation, questions, group discussion, and public comment. Detailed meeting minutes are being taken by a contractor, so all speakers should identify themselves before making a comment. Time for public comment has been scheduled for 11:15 a.m. Currently, there are no requests for public comment. If a member of the public is on the call and would like to request time to speak, he or she should e-mail Ms. Coates (coates.edie@epa.gov) during this call or simply request to speak during the public comment portion of the meeting. Comments are limited to 3 minutes.

Members of the Subcommittee were reminded to keep all travel receipts. Ms. Coates asked the Subcommittee members to record their time spent on this review on the timesheets that she will provide to them. Ms. Coates will collect them after the May 23, 2007, meeting. EPA will make travel arrangements for the Subcommittee members, trying to accommodate each member to the extent possible.

Dr. Jim Johnson asked if transportation was available to and from the meeting site or if a rental car was necessary. Ms. Coates responded that the meeting logistical sheet indicated that a shuttle is available.

A roll call of conference call attendees was completed, and a list of the participants is attached.

Questions and Discussion of Charge
Dr. Gary Sayler, Subcommittee Chair, and Mr. Phillip Juengst, EPA/ORD/Office of Resources Management Administration

Dr. Sayler received his binder of information this morning and asked if other Subcommittee members had as well; four Subcommittee members indicated they had not received their binders. Ms. Coates explained that they should be receiving it soon; she added that all of the materials contained in the binder also had been sent to the Subcommittee members electronically.

The materials for the mid-cycle review include:

- ✧ List of the Subcommittee members.
- ✧ The draft charge.
- ✧ The face-to-face meeting agenda.
- ✧ The original 2005 BOSC Drinking Water Research Program Report.
- ✧ ORD's response document.

- ✧ The followup from the 2005 BOSC Program Review.

One document, the revised Drinking Water Research Multi-Year Plan (MYP), has not been sent yet to the Subcommittee members. The MYP will be discussed during today's call.

The charge provided in the binder differs slightly from the original draft charge that was sent on February 27, 2007. The version in the binder has six charge questions, and the original version had five. The additional charge question is: "Does the Drinking Water MYP provide adequate research support that meets the regulatory mandates of the Safe Drinking Water Act in terms of the 6-year review of existing regulations and anticipatory regulatory uses themselves?" Dr. Audrey Levine, National Program Director (NPD) for Drinking Water, circulated the charge questions and addressed the additional charge question issue. She indicated that the version with five questions is the correct version. Ms. Coates will send the Subcommittee members the correct version via e-mail.

Previously, Subcommittee members were asked to examine the original recommendations made by the BOSC Subcommittee, address the preliminary ORD response to those questions, and provide an overall qualitative evaluation. Each Subcommittee member has been asked to provide a written evaluation and send it to Dr. Sayler; two have been received to date.

The original ORD response from Dr. Greg Sayles, Acting NPD, should be compared to the new document for the 2007 Mid-Cycle Review that Dr. Levine has prepared and will present during this call. Dr. Sayler asked the Subcommittee members if, after studying both of the documents, they had any questions.

Dr. Mary Ward asked if Dr. Sayler had received her draft response that was sent on April 19, 2007. Dr. Sayler responded that he recently had switched e-mail systems, and it may have been overlooked in the transfer. Dr. Ward said she would resend the document.

Dr. Sayler stated that Subcommittee responses probably will be tempered by the new document received yesterday; members may need to re-examine their original recommendations. He asked each Subcommittee member if he or she had any questions. Dr. Johnson did not have any questions at this moment as he has not had a chance to review the new document. Dr. James Raymer also has not had the opportunity to examine the document in detail, but skimming it revealed some significant wording changes that addressed one of his concerns. Dr. Ward also noticed that there were some changes but did not have any specific questions. Dr. Chi-Hsin Selene Chou stated that the comments she submitted to Dr. Sayler were based on the original document, and as she did not have the opportunity to read the new document, she has no comments at this point.

Dr. Sayler asked if there were any concerns about the charge of the Subcommittee. He reminded the Subcommittee members that this is a mid-cycle review, not a full evaluation of the Program, and Subcommittee members should evaluate responses to previous concerns and give advice and guidance about the future direction of the DWRP.

Dr. Sayler received another document from the DFO that morning from the BOSC Executive Committee entitled "Guidance for BOSC Review Mid-Cycle Performance Rating," which compares mid-cycle review qualitative analysis to a full program review.

Mr. Phillip Juengst introduced himself and explained that he is the Accountability Team Leader for ORD. He described the reasoning behind the BOSC review performance ratings. As a result of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993, all federal programs are required to develop performance measures. ORD has struggled to develop long-term measures of outcomes because of the difficulties in quantifying improvements to human health and the environment. A working group comprised of members of the BOSC, ORD, and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) developed a methodology that would give a rating to assess a program's performance and track it over time.

The core elements of this rating are the quality of research, the relevance or significance of the research, and performance and outcomes. Currently, this new rating system is being pilot tested, and the BOSC is asking for a summary assessment that links a qualitative rating (e.g., exceptional, exceeds expectations, satisfactory, not satisfactory) to each long-term goal (LTG).

Mid-Cycle Reviews are progress reviews, not full program reviews; therefore, ORD is not asking for the same type of rating. ORD expects a parallel rating of progress, using the same measures as above (exceptional, etc.) to provide a single overall rating for the Mid-Cycle Review of the program in terms of progress, quality, relevance, timeliness, and expected impact.

Dr. Johnson commented that, in a mid-cycle review, the following questions must be asked: (1) Are recommended changes being implemented? (2) Is the program making the right progress? (3) Are the right questions being addressed?

Mr. Juengst stated that the mid-cycle reviews are intended to provide additional information to ORD that will help leadership and researchers understand the strengths and weaknesses of ORD's programs, including information that can be used to manage the program and set targets for improvement. The goal of the mid-cycle review is the production of a summary narrative that explains why Subcommittee members think the program is or is not making satisfactory progress, where progress has been good, and where it has been lagging in terms of timeliness or the strength of the actions being taken.

Dr. Sayler asked if the qualitative evaluation moved forward through the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) process and if OMB actually reviews the evaluations. Mr. Juengst responded that OMB does see the evaluations, and the review itself is critical evidence for the PART. In the next full program review for the Drinking Water Research Program, this rating will be a performance metric for the DWRP. OMB will examine the mid-cycle review as well, but by itself that rating will not be a performance measure baseline data point.

EPA's Drinking Water Research Program
Dr. Audrey Levine, EPA/ORD, NPD for Drinking Water

Dr. Levine explained that she would provide an overview research program and its future direction, explain the revisions to the LTGs, provide an update on progress, describe the program metrics, and present some feedback on the results from the PART review.

The DWRP was crafted by a research coordinating team, including representatives from ORD, EPA laboratories and centers, and the Office of Water (OW), that developed the vision, LTGs, and specific projects. The program's mission statement was provided to Subcommittee members so that they would understand the focus of the DWRP, which is to characterize and manage

health risks associated with the production and distribution of drinking water for public water supplies and also to promote the sustainability of water resources and water infrastructure.

The research coordinating team re-organized the program to focus on the water cycle, and the research falls into four theme areas: (1) Source Water, (2) Treatment and Treatment Residuals, (3) Distribution Systems and Storage, and (4) Water Use. This is a shift from the former organization, and determining where rules and regulations fit under the different theme areas is the new focus. In this context, new LTGs have been developed, which partially explains the delay in the completion of the MYP.

Following the 2005 PART review, the three previous LTGs were condensed into two LTGs that integrate some of the regulatory issues in the context of the water cycle. The new LTG 1 focuses on regulated contaminants, and LTG 2 now focuses on unregulated contaminants and the EPA Contaminant Candidate List (CCL). The Drinking Water Research Program is working to reconcile the requirements for both the 6-year PART process and 5-year CCL process with its research goals. The 2007 MYP revision process considers the necessity of a structure that addresses outcomes versus outputs and allows for a more integrated and comprehensive approach to research.

LTG 1 focuses on risk characterization and examines what research is being done and what research is needed. Focusing risk characterization under one LTG and applying it to the different theme areas made sense to the team. It still is a proposed LTG, so comments and suggestions from the Subcommittee are welcome. This LTG provides the scientific underpinning for health risk assessments as well as tools to monitor conditions in the environment that would feed into risk assessments and other types of information that are needed in the regulatory process; it is not restricted to just existing regulations.

LTG 2 takes information and applies it to risk management. The focus of this LTG is on implementing rules. There are many challenges regarding simultaneous compliance with various regulations. For example, some utility companies have changed the methods by which they decontaminate water, and these new methods sometimes have unintended consequences.

Dr. Sayler asked if a source water component was included. Dr. Levine replied that it was included; each of the LTGs includes source water.

Dr. Levine explained the relationship of the LTGs to the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) research needs. Another theme area called assessment tools was added, which includes tools that apply to the overall program (e.g., monitoring tools to assess pathogen viability); the tool being used is important. For LTG 1, tools would include developing monitoring capabilities to address some of the chemical contaminants that are on the CCL and in the Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Regulations. Under LTG 2, tools would include models to evaluate distribution systems and framework for monitoring chemical contaminants.

Dr. Sayler commented that logically this approach made sense, but it is in essence a huge shopping list. He asked how the availability of resources interfaced with this concept. Dr. Levine responded that currently a lot of energy is being spent on the revision and recrafting of the MYP. The Groundwater Rule was implemented last year, so the focus is more on implementation than on characterization. In terms of priorities, research must provide information in a timely manner to ensure that it helps the decision process. Strong

communication between the OW, ORD researchers, the Science Advisory Board (SAB), and the BOSC ensures that opportunities for prioritization are generated. Although budgets always are challenging, the resources available are considered, and researchers use these resources to determine what can be done effectively.

Dr. Ward asked where epidemiologic studies fit into the LTGs. Dr. Levine replied that these studies are implicitly included in the health risks verbiage. Dr. Ward commented that health outcomes research encompasses risk assessment and epidemiologic research. Dr. Levine agreed and added that the wording of the LTG could be changed to include this specifically if the Subcommittee members feel strongly about it. LTG 1 would be the methodology for epidemiology studies or for examining health effects; LTG 2 would be the execution of these types of studies (e.g., prospective or retrospective studies or waterborne disease outbreak studies).

Dr. Levine explained how drinking water research feeds into the different theme areas, ultimately evaluating exposure and characterizing health effects. This evaluation and characterization then provides input into risk assessment, which in turn provides input into regulatory decisions. Sample source water research topics for LTG 1 include water quality characterization, watershed models, monitoring tools, and factors involving algae and cyanobacteria, whereas source water research topics for LTG 2 include best management practices for nonpoint discharges, source water protection, impacts of carbon sequestration, aquifer storage and recovery, and groundwater recharge. In terms of treatment, LTG 1 research topics include monitoring tools, CCL contaminants, pathogen identification and characterization, and disinfection efficacy and reaction characterizations, whereas LTG 2 research topics regarding treatment include technologies for the removal and control of contaminants, simultaneous compliance, and residuals management. Distribution systems research could focus on biofilm characterization, pipeline chemical release characterization, hydraulic models, infrastructure assessment tools, and exposure models under LTG 1, and focus on management of distribution systems, infrastructure rehabilitation, and the Total Coliform Rule and Lead and Copper Rule under LTG 2. In terms of water use and health outcomes, LTG 1 research could focus on health effects of chemicals and pathogens, mode of action, and dose response, whereas LTG 2 could focus on epidemiology studies, waterborne disease outbreak assessment, and potable and nonpotable health outcomes.

EPA has a variety of research programs, many of which interface with the DWRP. Within EPA, there are eight NPDs and approximately 12 national programs, each of which has an MYP for accountability. The DWRP is a problem-driven program as opposed to a core program. Dr. Levine gave an overview of the Human Health Research Program, the Human Health Risk Assessment Program, the Water Quality Program, the Ecosystem Services Program, the Land Resources Program, the Endocrine Disruptors Program, the Global Change Program, the Air Quality Program, the Sustainability Program, the Safe Products and Safe Pesticides Program, and the Nanotechnology Program, as well as the National Center for Computational Toxicology (NCCT). How the DWRP is related to each of these programs is explained in more detail in the Drinking Water MYP.

Public Comment

Ms. Coates interrupted Dr. Levine's presentation to call for public comments at 11:15 a.m. When no comments were offered, Dr. Levine resumed her presentation.

EPA's Drinking Water Research Program (continued)
Dr. Audrey Levine, EPA/ORD, NPD for Drinking Water

Two participants commented that the Program, as described, appeared very comprehensive and integrated.

Dr. Johnson commented that one attitude mentioned earlier was that as long as the work was being done, it did not matter where it was being done. He noted, however, that where the work is being done speaks to efficiency and effectiveness and should be considered. Dr. Levine agreed and added that right now the programs are in a process of evolution and are crafting new MYPs and LTGs. As this settles down, some of these types of issues will find their proper "home."

ORD is trying to design this program to be an applied program with enough flexibility to meet both current and future research needs. It is important to integrate some important topics, such as sustainable water systems and preparations for global change, and have the program vehicles be able to accommodate emerging issues.

Dr. Levine discussed a diagram that showed the water cycle and different elements of the research project. The starting point for water research is the source, because understanding what is in the source translates into treatment. Treatment, distribution, storage, water needs, collection, wastewater treatment, reclamation, and discharge all are integral parts of the overall process. As reclaimed water circulates through the system, additional measures are needed to protect human health. Reclaimed water is allowing rises in selenium, salt, bromide, chloride, and so forth. A cascade of effects can occur that must be monitored and understood.

The DWRP has had success in the areas of arsenic, monitoring tools, and pathogens. EPA is assisting utilities that have arsenic problems as well as difficulties implementing treatment for these problems. ORD also has developed several monitoring methods to quantify new microorganisms and chemicals as they are added to the CCL. Pathogen research is important and a strong research area at EPA laboratories, and much progress has been made in terms of surveillance and development of monitoring methods.

Anticipated outcomes during the next few years include regulatory decision support (e.g., health effects data, monitoring methods, treatment strategies, and performance information); infrastructure and distribution systems (e.g., developing cost-effective tools to assess the condition of pipelines and data analysis to develop methods of rehabilitating systems without having to excavate and replace entire pipelines); and pathogens (e.g., developing best management practices, monitoring methods to evaluate pathogens, controlling pathogens in water sources). Projected areas of emphasis include protection of source water, pathogen research, and drinking water distribution.

Dr. Levine provided an overview of the previous Drinking Water Research Program PART review, which occurred while Dr. Greg Sayles was the Acting NPD. The PART score was 54.9 out of 100, with the major weakness being in accountability.

Dr. Johnson commented that an important component of the PART process was the development of successful LTGs. He asked if there had been any conversations with OMB about whether the new LTGs are acceptable. Dr. Levine responded that ORD is hoping to do that. The OMB

examiner has been invited to attend the May meeting, and OMB has expressed interest. In crafting these new LTGs, accountability measures are being included. If this has been designed properly, there should be enough measures in place to be able to provide feedback, but OMB approval of the LTGs is desirable. The belief is that OMB probably does not understand the intricacies of the research, and Dr. Levine is hoping to have a dialogue with OMB about this concern. Dr. Johnson commented that OMB does not always understand the intricacies of the research but still imposes its standards, and the type of dialogue desired by Dr. Levine may not occur. Dr. Levine indicated that she was aware this may be a problem, but if the Subcommittee is supportive of the research, this may provide a bridge.

Positive outcomes of the PART review included program design, relevancy, and purpose. Areas that needed work were how performance data are collected, demonstration that budget requests are tied to the accomplishment of Annual Performance Goals (APGs) and LTGs, and demonstration that performance information is used to manage and improve the program. Performance metrics include bibliometric analysis, which compares all of the publications (approximately 1,200 to date) that have resulted from the DWRP to references that have been used in regulatory decisions; a Web site that links various databases that will help in the development of synthesis documents and determine research needs; and a client survey in which the OW (the client) was surveyed regarding different attributes of the DWRP.

Dr. Sayler asked if there would be more discussion at the face-to-face meeting about the development of the searchable database that is used as a performance metric. Dr. Levine replied that it is a work in progress, but it could be included at the Subcommittee's request. Dr. Sayler stated that the Subcommittee would probably be more interested in how the output was arrived at in terms of how issues were weighted than in the output itself. Dr. Levine replied that this information will be provided at the face-to-face meeting.

Dr. Levine added that the efficiency measures that Mr. Juengst discussed earlier also were going to be used as performance metrics. These performance metrics are being written into the MYP so that each LTG is subdivided into APGs, which are met by Annual Performance Measures (APMs).

Subcommittee Discussion
Dr. Gary Sayler, Subcommittee Chair

Dr. Ward commented that she understood that the client survey was a pilot; she asked about the number of clients that were contacted and the response rate. Dr. Levine replied that she did not have the exact numbers, but the response rate was a good because the clients were eager to participate. Dr. Ward commented that a survey is an excellent idea, and it could be incorporated into the APMs, especially as one of the comments in the 2005 program review was related to how the DWRP responds to client needs. Dr. Levine answered that people often get burned out on surveys. Dr. Ward agreed that it should not be done on an annual basis.

Dr. Ward asked to see examples of partnering and leveraging. Dr. Levine replied that Subcommittee members would be sent a comprehensive list of partners by May 15.

Dr. Raymer stated, in terms of the comments about intricacies of research not always being appreciated, that clients' expectations may not be truly understood. Dr. Levine agreed that each

office has its own perspectives and needs and trying to examine them collectively is when the mixed messages are received.

Dr. Ward asked if the survey was going to focus on EPA input or if the survey would be expanded. Dr. Levine replied that the current focus was on EPA, but it will be good to receive input from other stakeholders in the future.

Dr. Raymer commented that it would be interesting to see what types of plans have been discussed by EPA and the Homeland Security Research Center that meet the needs of both programs. Dr. Levine responded that real-time monitoring of drinking water is being driven by both programs. Currently, the Homeland Security Program is developing an MYP, and the DWRP is ensuring it is represented in the MYP process. The former NPD for Drinking Water now is the NPD for Homeland Security, so the lines of communication are good. Dr. Levine asked if the Subcommittee members would like to see more details on this at the face-to-face meeting, and Dr. Raymer indicated that he would.

Dr. Sayler asked how much commitment there is in the individual programs to ensure continued funding for the Science To Achieve Results (STAR) Program. He indicated that an answer was not necessary now, but the information should be available at the face-to-face meeting. Dr. Levine responded that the National Center for Environmental Research (NCER) Project Officer that manages STAR research related to drinking water could attend the face-to-face meeting and address this issue. Dr. Sayler agreed this would be fine.

Dr. Sayler commented that in the section on the ability to respond to detection of new contaminants in a timely manner, in the original report, the planning horizon was 5-10 years, but the Progress Update indicates a planning horizon of 8-10 years. The ability to respond appears to be moving farther away, especially in terms of dealing with contaminants. He also indicated that he was unclear how the NCCT will provide new screening opportunities that will help in drinking water for timely responses. Dr. Levine responded that the NCCT has developed some high-throughput screening technologies that provide a way to weed through some of the chemicals. For the planning horizon, 8-10 years was specified in the MYP, but the true focus is 3 years.

Dr. Sayler commented that expanding the level of interaction with other institutions, not just other programs or offices within the Agency, was a recommendation during the BOSC program review. It appears as though there has been a heavy focus on Agency interaction, but it would be interesting to see if progress is being made on working with academic institutions and so forth. Dr. Levine replied that the Progress Update details some of the work with academic institutions. The DWRP also is working with the National Children's Study.

Dr. Sayler commented that the water reuse issue seems to be taking on additional prominence now, and it will be interesting to see if this continues. He asked if there will be more studies on agriculture issues. Dr. Levine asked if he would like to see more details about that at the May meeting. Dr. Sayler responded affirmatively but asked that the presentation be brief.

Dr. Sayler commented that the response to scientific quality in the Progress Update points to the bibliometric analysis. In the original 2005 program review, one of the issues that the Subcommittee was particularly concerned with was how to ensure scientific quality in some of these programs, such as co-op programs.

Dr. Sayler clarified that the Subcommittee indicated that the DWRP runs the risk of becoming too applications oriented, not that it already is.

Dr. Sayler asked Subcommittee members if there were any additional documents or information that they needed for the review. The Subcommittee members indicated they have everything they need.

Ms. Coates asked Subcommittee members if there were any additional comments about what they are expecting to see in the next few weeks. She is making a list of concerns and a list of items the members would like to see at the May meeting. She will make sure Subcommittee members have that information.

Dr. Sayler asked if the agenda for the face-to-face meeting would be ready by mid-May. Ms. Coates responded that speakers are being finalized, and then the agenda will be sent to him for his input. Dr. Sayler added that he hopes there is time during the face-to-face meeting for the Subcommittee to review and evaluate the draft report. Ms. Coates responded that in the past, 35 minutes were set aside for this process, but it can be adjusted as needed.

Dr. Levine asked Subcommittee members to let her know if there are other issues that they would like to see addressed at the face-to-face meeting. Dr. Sayler added that Subcommittee members should think about this and send their comments to him so that he can forward any requests to Dr. Levine.

Dr. Sayler indicated that the lunch during the face-to-face meeting should be a working lunch. Ms. Coates stated that she would include that in the agenda.

A Subcommittee member asked Dr. Sayler when, based on the new report, the revisions to the draft responses were due. Dr. Sayler responded that they should be sent to him by May 6 (within 10 days of the call) if possible.

When there were no additional comments or questions, Dr. Sayler adjourned the conference call at 12:12 p.m.

Action Items

- ✧ Ms. Coates will e-mail the correct version of the charge to the Subcommittee members.
- ✧ Dr. Ward will resend her draft response to Dr. Sayler.
- ✧ Dr. Levine will prepare information about the searchable database for the face-to-face meeting.
- ✧ Dr. Levine will forward a list of program partners to the Subcommittee members.
- ✧ Dr. Levine will prepare information about the DWRP's involvement in the Homeland Security MYP process for the face-to-face meeting.
- ✧ Dr. Levine will invite the NCER Project Officer for drinking water grants to the face-to-face meeting.

- ✧ Dr. Levine will prepare brief information about research related to agricultural issues for the face-to-face meeting.

- ✧ Ms. Coates will forward the face-to-face meeting agenda to Dr. Sayler as soon as the speakers are finalized. Dr. Sayler will provide his input on the agenda to Ms. Coates, she then will finalize the agenda and circulate it to the Subcommittee members.

- ✧ Subcommittee members will forward any requests for additional information to Dr. Sayler.

- ✧ Subcommittee members will forward their revised draft responses to Dr. Sayler by May 6 (within 10 days of the conference call).

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Subcommittee Members

Gary S. Sayler, Ph.D.
Professor of Microbiology and Ecology and Director
The Center for Environmental Biotechnology
University of Tennessee
676 Dabney Hall
Knoxville, TN 37996-1605
Phone: 865-974-8080
E-mail: sayler@utk.edu

Chi-Hsin Selene Chou, Ph.D.
Environmental Health Scientist
Scientific Assessment Team
Emergency Response and Scientific Assessment Branch
Division of Toxicology
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
1600 Clifton Road, MS F32
Atlanta, GA 30333
Phone: 770-488-3357
E-mail: cjc3@cdc.gov

James H. Johnson, Jr., Ph.D., P.E., DEE
Professor of Civil Engineering and Dean
College of Engineering, Architecture, and Computer Sciences
Howard University
Washington, DC 20059
Phone: 202-806-6565
E-mail: jj@scs.howard.edu

James Raymer, Ph.D.
Senior Program Director
Exposure Analysis Research
RTI International
PO Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
Phone: 919-541-6000
E-mail: jraymer@rti.org

Mary H. Ward, Ph.D.
Investigator
Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics
National Cancer Institute
National Institutes of Health
Executive Plaza South, MSC 7335
6120 Executive Boulevard
Bethesda, MD 20892-7335
Phone: 301-435-4713
E-mail: wardm@mail.nih.gov

Designated Federal Officer

Edith Coates
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory (B105-03)
109 TW Alexander Drive
Research Triangle Park, NC 27711
Phone: 919-541-3508
E-mail: coates.edie@epa.gov

EPA Participants

Hiba Ernst, Ph.D.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Water
Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water
26 W Martin Luther King Drive (140)
Cincinnati, OH 45268
Phone: 513-569-7943
E-mail: ernst.hiba@epa.gov

Kesha Forrest
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Water
Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water
Ariel Rios Building (4607M)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: 202-564-3632
E-mail: forrest.kesha@epa.gov

James Goodrich
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
National Risk Management Research Laboratory
26 W Martin Luther King Drive (689)
Cincinnati, OH 45268
Phone: 513-569-7605
E-mail: goodrich.james@epa.gov

Phillip Juengst
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
Office of Resources Management Administration
Ariel Rios Building (8102R)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: 202-564-2645
E-mail: juengst.phillip@epa.gov

Audrey Levine, Ph.D., P.E.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
Ariel Rios Building (8102R)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: 202-564-1070
E-mail: levine.audrey@epa.gov

Michael Loughran
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
Ariel Rios Building (8102R)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: 202-564-6686
E-mail: loughran.michael@epa.gov

Bruce Mintz
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
National Exposure Research Laboratory (D305-01)
109 TW Alexander Drive
Research Triangle Park, NC 27711
Phone: 919-541-0272
E-mail: mintz.bruce@epa.gov

Angela Page
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
National Center for Environmental Research
Ariel Rios Building (8722F)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
Phone: 202-343-9826
E-mail: page.angela@epa.gov

William Russo
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory (B305-02)
Research Triangle Park, NC 27711
Phone: 919-541-7869
E-mail: russo.bill@epa.gov

Other Participants

Maria Mahar
Arizona Public Services Company
Environmental, Health and Safety Department
Phone: 602-615-8408

Chad Sidell
David S. Williams and Associates

Contractor Support

Jen Hurlburt
The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc.
656 Quince Orchard Road, Suite 210
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Phone: 301-670-4990
E-mail: jhurlburt@scgcorp.com

APPENDIX A: Teleconference Agenda

DRINKING WATER MID-CYCLE SUBCOMMITTEE
TELECONFERENCE MEETING
AGENDA
April 26, 2007
10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

Thursday, April 26 2007

10:00 a.m.-10:05 a.m.	Welcome	Dr. Gary Sayler Chair, DW Mid-Cycle Subcommittee
10:05 a.m.-10:15 a.m.	Administrative Procedures - FACA Rules and Procedures - Receipts, Timesheets - Logistics for Face-to-Face Meeting	Edie Coates (EPA) DFO, DW Mid-Cycle Subcommittee
10:15 a.m.-10:45 p.m.	Questions and Discussion of Charge	Dr. Gary Sayler Chair, DW Mid-Cycle Subcommittee Phillip Juengst (EPA/ORMA)
10:45 a.m.-11: 15 a.m.	EPA's DW Research Program - Overview of DW Research Program - Brief Summary of Multi-Year Plan Revisions and Status - Progress Update From 2005 BOSC Recommendations - Summary of DW Research Program Metrics - Summary of PART Review Findings	Dr. Audrey Levine (EPA) National Program Director for Drinking Water Research
11:15 a.m.-11:25 a.m.	Public Comment	
11:25 a.m.-12:30 p.m.	Subcommittee Discussion - Questions and Answers - Next Steps Discussion - Outstanding Data Needs/Requests	Dr. Gary Sayler Chair, DW Mid-Cycle Subcommittee
12:30 p.m.	Adjourn	